

**Draft Summary of Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
July 22, 2003**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Cultural Resources Work Group (CRWG) meeting on July 22, 2003 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary.

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Cultural Resource Action Worksheet
Attachment 4	Cultural Resource Goals and Resource Actions
Attachment 5	Draft Resource Action Identification Form – Foreman Creek Closure

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the CRWG meeting and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and a list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

Action Items – June 17, 2003 CRWG Meeting

A summary of the June 2003 CRWG meeting is posted on the project web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

Action Item #C50:	Distribute blank Resource Action Identification Forms to CRWG participants
Status:	DWR distributed form before July 7, 2003.
Action Item #C51:	Complete Resource Action Identification Forms for Resource Actions as assigned.
Status:	Resource Action discussion is part of the agenda for this meeting (see discussion below).
Action Item # C52:	Review Cultural Resources Work Group Roster and provide revisions and corrections to the Facilitator.
Status:	The roster was again circulated at the July 2003 CRWG meeting and participants were asked to provide missing information. The Facilitator agreed to send Ellen Clark, Department of Parks and Recreation, a hard copy of the roster.

Study Plan Implementation Update

Michael Jablonowski, Sonoma State University, gave an update on the study effort and explained that a crew had been in the field for the last couple of weeks recording historic period sites identified in April. He informed the group that the crew should finish within a week. He also said that CSU, Sacramento crews have completed their fieldwork at the prehistoric sites. Janis Offermann added that the ethnographers have finished most of their interviews. She explained that the interviews are transcribed and provided to the interviewee for review and revision if necessary. Each interviewee will sign their interview transcription to indicate approval, and Tribes will receive copies of the transcripts.

Eric Ritter, BLM, asked the status of his comments submitted on the draft archaeological inventory document and was informed his comments have been forwarded to the author. One participant asked if CSU, Sacramento would be doing more prehistoric work this summer. Janis responded that they are finished, but they may return to the field as necessary.

Maidu Advisory Council Update

Art Angle, representing Enterprise Rancheria, provided the update and informed the CRWG that two of the federally recognized Tribes had withdrawn participation from the Maidu Advisory Council (MAC). He explained that the Enterprise Tribal Council would vote tomorrow (July 23) on withdrawal from the MAC and notify DWR of its decision. He suggested that the Tribes are uncomfortable with the role of the MAC in the collaborative process and reminded the CRWG that the Enterprise, Berry Creek and Mooretown Tribal Councils had sent a letter to DWR informing them that the MAC does not represent the interests of the Tribes for purposes of decision-making. The CRWG confirmed their understanding that the representatives on the MAC were acting as information conduits to their respective Tribal councils and bringing their viewpoints back to the MAC to assist in issue resolution. Art clarified that the Tribes want to establish a government-to-government dialogue with the State of California rather than a State agency. Patty Reece Allen added that the Tribes wish to establish the government-to-government communication with someone who will remain appointed for at least the duration of the relicensing process to establish continuity.

Art indicated that the MAC would dissolve with the withdrawal of the three Tribes, however Janis Offermann noted that the Mechoopda and the Kon Kow Maidu have both expressed interest in continuing the MAC. One participant asked what effect this action would have on decisions already made by the MAC. It was noted that the effect was unknown at this time, but that some earlier decisions might be reviewed.

Resource Action Discussion

Chris Acken, DWR, distributed the Cultural Resource Action Worksheet and the Cultural Resource Goals and Resource Actions tables revised at the June 2003 CRWG meeting (Attachments 3 and 4). The Facilitator suggested if there are multiple actions that might meet the resource goals, that the CRWG consider which would have the broadest support from the participants. She explained that the potential resource actions are to be forwarded to the Plenary Group starting in September and also submitted to the Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment (PDEA) group, who will be analyzing the actions and preparing the draft environmental document. The Facilitator explained that while the entire list of resource actions developed by the CRWG will be forwarded to the PDEA group, a goal common to all work groups is to identify the priority actions or the ones with broad work group support. After priority actions are identified, potential cross resource conflicts will be identified for work group discussion.

Eric Ritter, representing the BLM, asked when the information from studies would be incorporated into the process, particularly on sites not yet evaluated for eligibility. Steve Heipel responded that the study information is currently incomplete, so it is premature to develop resource actions related to specific sites; however, actions could be discussed in terms of a proposed management plan.

One participant asked what would happen if DWR did not file the relicensing application in time. The Facilitator responded that the license would be open for application by anyone who wanted to file. Chris Acken added that DWR will file an application by the deadline, January 31, 2005, and pointed out that if FERC has not made a decision on a new license by the current license expiration date, then DWR could be allowed to operate on an annual license under existing terms until a decision is made.

The CRWG reviewed the list of proposed resource actions and discussed how each idea or issue was tracked from the original issue tracker. Eric Ritter asked where a proposed resource action that addresses the effects of lake level fluctuations on archaeological sites would be included on the worksheet. Janis suggested Eric write a new resource action proposal to be included under 'Provide Protection/Mitigation of all significant cultural resource values within the APE (including those that lie beneath the reservoir)'; Eric consented to this suggestion.

One participant asked Eric whether there is enough archaeological evidence to qualify the area around the Oroville Reservoir for a National Indian Trail. Eric answered that in his opinion there is adequate evidence to qualify for a trail circumnavigating the reservoir. The CRWG discussed the need for educational information at trailheads and along trails within the project area. DWR will confirm that the resource action #C004 includes informational kiosks and trailhead displays.

The CRWG discussed whether legally owned objects would be included in the proposed amnesty program to return illegally held Native American funerary objects. Michael Jablonowski observed that it would be up to the Tribes whether they wanted to accept them. Eric Ritter suggested developing a separate resource action proposal to establish a program encouraging the return of local cultural materials from private collections. The CRWG agreed, and Eric will prepare a Resource Action Identification Form.

DWR distributed a completed draft Resource Action Identification Form on the closure of Foreman Creek prepared by Steve Heipel (Attachment 5). As an illustrative exercise, Steve reviewed the form with the group, describing how he completed each section. The Facilitator confirmed that there is only one version of the form and encouraged others in the work group to further the process by completing forms for proposed resource actions. DWR will distribute the revised Cultural Resource Goals and Resource Actions matrix to the CRWG.

Next Meeting and Next Steps

The Facilitator announced that a Modeling Workshop would be held August 12, 2003, at CSU, Chico. The Workshop will provide an opportunity to review preliminary modeling results of benchmark scenarios designed to assist in evaluating potential changes in the operation of Oroville facilities. Several participants expressed interest in attending the Workshop.

The Facilitator suggested members of the CRWG start thinking about which proposed resource actions are most important to them in preparation for a discussion of priorities at next month's CRWG meeting. The Facilitator noted that the next CRWG meeting would be:

Date: August 19, 2003
Time: 5:30 – 9:30 p.m.
Location: To be determined

Action Items

#C53: Confirm C004 includes kiosks and trailhead interpretive displays.
Responsible: DWR
Due Date: August 2003

#C54: Send revised Cultural Resource Goals and Resource Actions tables to distribution list.
Responsible: DWR
Due Date: August 2003

#C55: Send Cultural Resources Work Group roster via regular mail to Ellen Clark.
Responsible: Facilitator
Due Date: August 2003